



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,604	06/01/2001	Robert E. Callies	Lindsay 51	2262
	7590	01/07/2009	EXAMINER	
Joel H. Bock, COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD. 200 West Adams Street - Suite 2850 Chicago, IL 60606			HWU, DAVIS D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

8  
9  
10 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
11 AND INTERFERENCES  
12

13  
14 *Ex parte* ROBERT E. CALLIES and CHARLES H. MEIS  
15

16  
17 Appeal 2008-3453  
18 Application 09/872,604  
19 Technology Center 3700  
20

21  
22 Decided: January 6, 2009  
23

24  
25 *Before:* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, ANTON W. FETTING and DAVID  
26 B. WALKER, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

27  
28 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*  
29

30  
31 DECISION ON APPEAL  
32

33 STATEMENT OF CASE

34 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection  
35 of claims 1-9, 13-19 and 21-25. Claims 26-29 have been withdrawn as  
36 being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 10-12 and 20 are objected  
37 to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if

1 rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim  
2 and any intervening claims. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 16-19, 21  
3 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dunn was  
4 withdrawn in the Examiner's Answer mailed November 30, 2007. We have  
5 jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

6 Appellants invented a distribution tube assembly including a main  
7 supply line and a distribution tube frame including at least two fluid  
8 passageways (Specification [0029], [0030]).

9 Independent claims 1 and 16 under appeal read as follows:

10 1. A distribution tube assembly for an irrigation system of the  
11 type having a main supply line for conveying fluid, the distribution  
12 tube assembly comprising an elongated frame with a first upstream  
13 end, a second downstream end and at least two fluid passageways  
14 defined therein to permit more than one fluid stream therethrough,  
15 each passageway permitting fluid flow from the first upstream end to  
16 the second downstream end, at least one of the fluid passageways  
17 being in fluid communication with the main supply line, at least  
18 another of the fluid passageways being in fluid communication with a  
19 second fluid supply line.

20  
21 16. A distribution tube assembly for an irrigation system of the  
22 type having a main supply line for conveying fluid, the distribution  
23 tube assembly comprising a distribution tube framing having at least  
24 two fluid passageways defined therein and extending substantially  
25 throughout the frame between an upstream end and a downstream end  
26 to direct fluid flow from the upstream end to the downstream end, at  
27 least one of the fluid passageways being in fluid communication with  
28 the main supply line, at least another of the fluid passageways being  
29 in fluid communication with a second fluid supply line.

30  
31 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
32 appeal is:

1 Hane US 4,162,041 Jul. 24, 1979

2 The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 13, 14, 16-19, 21 and 23-25 under  
3 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hane.

4 The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
5 being unpatentable over Hane.

6 We REVERSE.

7

8 ISSUE

9 Did the Appellants show that the Examiner erred in finding that inner  
10 hole 18 of Hane is a “second fluid supply line” as recited in claims 1 and 16?

11

12

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

13 The Appellants invented a distribution tube assembly for irrigation  
14 including at least two passageways (Specification [0005]).

15 “At least one passageway receives fluid from the main supply. The  
16 remaining passageway or passageways may receive media from the main  
17 supply or from an alternate supply line” (Specification [0006]).

18 “At least one of the adaptor bores may be in fluid communication with  
19 the main supply line. Where chemicals and additives are used, one or more  
20 bores may be in fluid communication with an alternate supply line”  
21 (Specification [0007]).

22 “At least one of the first and second passageways 28, 32 may be in  
23 fluid communication with the main supply line 12, which may be connected  
24 to a water source. The other of the first and second passageways 28, 32 may  
25 be in fluid communication with an alternate supply line, which may be a  
26 pipe or hose attached to the main structure. The alternate supply line may be

1 connected to a reservoir containing chemicals, additives, pilot pressure fluid  
2 or the like” (Specification [0030]).

3 Separate media from separate supplies flow through the main supply  
4 line and the alternate supply line.

5 Hane discloses a liquid sprinkling device 1 including a master pipe 7,  
6 a plurality of main pipes 2 connected to master pipe 7 via branch sockets 6,  
7 and sub-pipes 3 connected to main pipes 2 via connection sockets 4, 5 (Fig.  
8 1; col. 6, ll. 15-22).

9 Connection socket 5 includes cylindrical guide wall 14 that, when  
10 placed in the proper rotational position, allows fluid flow from main pipe 2  
11 to sub-pipe 3 via inner hole 18, flow hole 19, and hole 15 (Figs. 5-6; col. 6,  
12 ll. 46-66).

13 The same fluid flows through master pipe 7 and inner hole 18.

14

15

#### PRINCIPLES OF LAW

16

17

18

19

20

During examination of a patent application, a pending claim is given  
the broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification and  
should be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one  
of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359,  
1369 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

21

22

23

24

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in  
the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior  
art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814  
F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

25

1 ANALYSIS

2 The Examiner argues that inner hole 18 of Hane corresponds to the  
3 “second fluid supply line” recited in claims 1 and 16 (Examiner’s Answer  
4 7). However, such an interpretation does not give appropriate weight to the  
5 proper construction of “second fluid supply line” in light of the express  
6 terms of the claim and the specification. *See In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech*  
7 *Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at 1369.

8 The Examiner argues that, without further limitations, the second fluid  
9 supply line does not require a fluid different from the main supply line  
10 (Examiner’s Answer 4, 7). However, the express claim terms “second fluid  
11 supply line” includes “second fluid” and “second fluid supply.” Implicit in  
12 that choice of phrasing is that the second fluid is separate from the main  
13 fluid, and the second fluid supply is separate from the main supply.  
14 Moreover, the Specification repeatedly discloses that one media from one  
15 supply flows through the main supply line while a second separate media  
16 from a second separate supply flows through the alternate supply line, in this  
17 case, water and chemicals, respectively. By contrast, fluid from the same  
18 supply flows through both master pipe 7 and inner hole 18 of Hane, the  
19 corresponding main supply line and second fluid supply line.

20 We will not sustain the rejection of claims 1 and 16 as being  
21 anticipated by Hane. As claims 2-9, 13-15, 17-19 and 21-25 depend from  
22 one of claims 1 and 16, we also will not sustain those rejections.

23  
24 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1           The Appellants did show that the Examiner erred in finding that inner  
2 hole 18 of Hane is a “second fluid supply line” as recited in claims 1 and 16.

3

4

DECISION

5           The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-9, 13-19 and 21-25 is  
6 reversed.

7

8

REVERSED

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 LV:

23

24

25

26

27 Joel H. Bock,  
28 COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
29 CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
30 200 West Adams Street - Suite 2850  
31 Chicago, IL 60606